

REMARKS

Claims 8-10, 11-22, and 24-38 are pending. Claims 8, 13, 14, 20, 22, and 25 have been amended, claims 1-7, 11, and 23 has been canceled, and new claims 33-38 have been added.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

At the outset, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for graciously extending Applicants' representative an interview on August 16, 2005 to discuss the rejections in the outstanding Office Action. The claims discussed and arguments presented during the interview are summarized below.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected all of the then-pending claims under 35 USC § 103(a) based on an Emmott-Fowler combination. For claims 1-7, the Emmott publication was used as the primary reference. For the remaining claims, the Fowler patent was used as the primary reference. Applicants respectfully submit that the presently pending claims are allowable over the cited combination, regardless of which reference is used as the primary reference based on the amendments introduced herein.

New claim 33, for example, recites a signal converting unit that performs the function of "automatically converting the downloaded cooking information into a signal

capable of being recognized by the microcomputer when said one of the displayed results is selected by a user.” The converted signal “control[s] the microcomputer to automatically set the oven to perform a cooking operation in response to a user signal.” In other words, when a user selects one of the displayed results of an Internet search performed by a search engine in the oven, the selected result is converted into a signal which automatically sets the oven (e.g., time, cooking power, or other cooking parameter) to perform a cooking operation for a specific type of food. These features are not taught or suggested by the cited combination of references.

The Emmott publication discloses an oven having a built-in Internet browser. When a search for cooking information is performed, a display in the oven shows the results. One of the results may then be downloaded for viewing based on a user selection. Unlike claim 33, the Emmott oven does not include a signal converting unit which automatically converts the downloaded cooking information into a signal capable of being recognized by the microcomputer when one of the displayed results is selected by a user. Emmott also does not use such a converted signal to control the microcomputer to automatically set the oven to perform a cooking operation in response to a user signal, as is also recited in claim 33. Instead, when one of the search results is displayed, a user must

manually set the oven parameters to perform a cooking operation and no signal conversion of the type claimed is ever performed.

The Fowler patent does not make up for the deficiencies of the Fowler patent. In Fowler, a microwave oven in a fast-food restaurant receives customer orders stored in a queue. (The orders are received from a cash register unit storing the LONworks module that contains the queue.) When a customer order is received, the oven is programmed with a cooking time or other parameter. An attendant then puts the food in the oven and presses START and the food is cooked. (See column 11, lines 26-67).

Unlike claim 33, the Fowler patent does not teach or suggest that its oven is programmed to perform a cooking operation based on a user's selection of one of a plurality of displayed Internet search results performed by a browser in the oven. Instead, the customer orders stored in the cash register (LONworks) queue controls programming of the oven.

The foregoing analysis is based on use of the Emmott publication as the primary reference. If the Fowler patent is taken as the primary reference, claim 33 remains non-obvious. That is, Fowler discloses an oven which is programmed based on customer orders stored in a LONworks module which is located in a fast-food cash register. Fowler does not teach or suggest automatically programming its oven based on a selection of one

of the displayed results of an Internet search for cooking information. On the other hand, Emmott discloses displaying results of an Internet search for cooking information. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Emmott of automatically programming an oven based on a selection of those displayed results. In fact, Emmott discloses just the opposite - that a manual programming operation must be performed based on the displayed results.

In summary, the Emmott and Fowler references do not individually or collectively teach or suggest an oven having the following features as recited in claim 33:

- (1) a signal converting unit which automatically converts a displayed result of an Internet search into a signal capable of being recognized by an oven microcomputer when that result is selected by a user, and
- (2) controlling the microcomputer to automatically set the oven to perform a cooking operation based on the convert signal.

Absent a teaching or suggestion of these features, it is respectfully submitted that claim 33 cannot be rendered obvious by any combination formed by the Emmott publication and the Fowler patent.

The Perholtz patent was cited to show that global interrupt signals are known. This patent, however, does not teach or suggest the features of the claimed invention noted above.

The remaining independent claims are also distinguishable from the cited combination. Claim 8, for example, recites “a converter which automatically converts one of a plurality of displayed results of an Internet search containing cooking information into a signal recognizable by the microcomputer in response to a first user signal,” that “the first user signal selects said one of said plurality of displayed results of the Internet search,” and that “the converted signal controls the microcomputer to automatically generate a control signal to set the oven to cook food based on the cooking information in response to a second user signal.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 16 recites that the data transmission available signal assumes a first level when the converter is in a state for sending data to the microcomputer and assumes a second level when the microcomputer is in a state for receiving data from the converter. The cited references do not individually or collectively teach or suggest a converter as presently recited in base claim 8 and therefore do not teach or suggest the further aspects of this converter as recited in claim 16.

Claim 17 recites that a global interrupt signal is input into the microcomputer when the data transmission available signal assumes said first level. As the Examiner has shown, global interrupt signals are known. However, none of the cited references teach or

suggest a global interrupt signal which is input into the microcomputer in association with a data transmission available signal as defined in claim 16 under the circumstances recited in claim 17. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claim 18 recites that a data read control signal is input into the microcomputer when the data transmission available signal assumes said first level. These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 19 recites that the data read control signal is a 1-byte interrupt signal. These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 22 recites “receiving a first user signal selecting of one of the Internet search results” and “automatically converting cooking information corresponding to the selected one of the Internet search results into a signal recognizable by a microcomputer in the oven in response to the first user signal.” Claim 22 further recites “receiving a second user signal for cooking food in the oven based on the signal corresponding to the converted cooking information.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Turning now to the dependent claims, claim 20 recites that the microcomputer “receives the converted signal containing the cooking information in synchronism with a data receive property signal, and wherein the microcomputer recognizes that it is in a ready state to receive data when the data receive property signal assumes a first value and recognizes that it is in a state where data reading has been completed with the data receive property signal assumes a second value.” In the Office Action, the Examiner alleged that the Fowler patent discloses the microcomputer.

However, Fowler does not teach or suggest the converted signal as presently recited in base claim 8, nor does it teach or suggest the receiving such a signal in synchronism with a data receive property signal, and that the microcomputer recognizes that it is in a ready state to receive data when the data receive property signal assumes a first value and recognizes that it is in a state where data reading has been completed with the data receive property signal assumes a second value.” It is respectfully submitted that claim 20 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claim 21 recites that the data transmission available signal, the global interrupt signal, the data read control signal, and the data receive property signal are received through different ports of the microcomputer. These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claims 27-32 recite additional features that patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references, for many of the same reasons noted with respect to the dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, it is submitted that these claims are also allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.


To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of

Serial No. 09/740,846

Docket No. K-0244

this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim

Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros

Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
Telephone: 703-766-3701
Facsimile: 703-766-3644
Date: August 26, 2005